<u>**REMARKS**</u>

Claims 1-8 and 10-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 15 and 25 have been amended as shown at pages 2-6 of the Reply. In addition, claim 27 has been cancelled.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interviews conducted on January 10, 2008. Examiner was contacted to discuss the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101, 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). During the interview a set of amendments were agreed upon that addressed all of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §102(e) identified in the Office Action. These amendments have been incorporated into the claims as shown above. Furthermore, Examiner indicated the claims 5 and 6 were allowable and if incorporated into the independent claims, the application would be in condition for allowance. As such, independent claims 1, 14, 15 and 25 have been amended to incorporate the allowable limitations of claim 5 and 6 rendering the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) moot.

In view of the comments made during the telephonic discussion and the amendments herein, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   <u>Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 25-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §101</u>

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 14 and 25 have been amended to recite embodiment of the components on computer readable storage mediums, in order to address the Examiner's contention that the body of the claims fail to recite physical structure. A computer readable storage medium clearly falls within the classes of statutory subject matter rendering this rejection moot. Furthermore, independent claim 27 has been cancelled. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stanley (US 6,219,742). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 27 has been cancelled.

III.   Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 9-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 9-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanley (US 6,219,742) in view of Tien, *et al.* (US 6,138,183 A). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Stanley and Tien, *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach each and every element of applicant's invention as recited in the subject claims.

> "Under 35 U.S.C. 103 where the examiner has relied on the teachings of
> several references, the test is whether or not the references viewed
> individually and collectively would have suggested the claimed invention to
> the person possessing ordinary skill in the art. It is to be noted, however, that
> citing references which merely indicated that isolated elements and/or features
> recited in the claims are known is not a sufficient basis for concluding that the
> combination of claimed elements would have been obvious. That is to say,
> there should be something in the prior art or a convincing line of reasoning in
> the answer suggesting the desirability of combining the references in such a
> manner as to arrive at the claimed invention... [I]t would not have been
> obvious to modify [the prior art] ... without using [the patent application's]
> claims as a guide. It is to be noted that simplicity and hindsight are not proper
> criteria for resolving the issue of obviousness."   *Ex parte Hiyamizu*, 10
> USPQ2d 1393 (BPAI 1988).

The subject claims relate to SMBus (System Management Bus) event notification handling and relates more particularly to handling SMBus event notification in ASL (ACPI Source Language) code, which is compiled into AML (ACPI Machine Language) code eliminating the need for the ASL code to manipulate lower level hardware, such as an embedded controller. Furthermore, applicants' claimed invention teaches three parameter buffer access read and write methods capable of transferring variable sized blocks that allow for more efficient and simplified data transfers. In particular, independent claim 1 recites *an AML event handler component; and, a driver component that identifies an SMBus event and dispatches the SMBus*

event to the AML event handler, where the AML event handler employs at least one of a three

parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with

the SMBus and a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation

region associated with the SMBus.

As conceded in the Office Action dated October 10, 2007, Stanley does not teach or

suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of the subject claims. Stanley teaches a system for

setting general purpose event register bits through software instead of from the peripheral device

through hardware. Stanley is silent regarding a three parameter buffer access read or write and

particularly one that is employed by an AML event handler. Tien, *et al.* is cited to make up for

this deficiency of Stanley. However, contrary to assertions in the Office Action, Tien, *et al.* also

fails to teach or suggest a three parameter buffer access read or write and particularly one that is

employed by an AML event handler. Cited column 3, lines 33-55 provide a general description

of the invention where an ISA bud is emulated by a PCI-DMAC memory access controller. This

section of the cited reference merely states that ISA write attempts are intercepted and copied to

the PCI-DMAC controller. The section fails to disclose a three parameter buffer read or write

access as recited in the subject claim. The Office Action further cites column 5, lines 28-34.

This section discloses a specific audio accelerator chip manufactured by ESS Technology named

MAESTRO-1 that is compliant with several industry audio standards. This section of the

reference is silent regarding buffer read and write accesses. Additionally, column 9, line 12 to

column 10, line 50 is cited. These paragraphs provide a more detailed description of the process

of write "snooping" of ISA writes in order for a PCI agent to determine if the write should be

copied to the PCI-DMAC. The section further describes register stuffing in order to

accommodate legacy ISA read accesses. These methods of write "snooping" and register

stuffing provide compatibility with ISA resources from a PCI bus by creating a virtual ISA bus.

Yet, this section of the cited reference, like the other cited sections, is also silent regarding a

three parameter buffer access read or write and particularly one that is employed by an AML

event handler. Therefore, Stanley and Tien, *et al.* fail to teach or suggest an AML event handler

component; and, a driver component that identifies an SMBus event and dispatches the SMBus

event to the AML event handler, where the AML event handler employs at least one of a three

parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with the

SMBus and a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation region associated with the SMBus.

Moreover independent claim 14 recites *a computer executable dispatcher in the driver embodied on a computer readable storage medium that directly dispatches the SMBus event notification to a computer executable AML (ACPI Machine Language) event handler, where **the AML event handler employs at least one of a three parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with the SMBus or a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation region associated with the SMBus***. As discussed above, Stanley and Tien, *et al.* fail to teach or suggest a three parameter buffer access read or write that is employed by an AML event handler. As such, the cited references are not obvious over all novel aspects of the subject claims.

Additionally, independent claim 15 recites *dispatching the SMBus event notification to an AML (ACPI Machine Language) event handler, where **the AML event handler employs at least one of a three parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with the SMBus or a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation region associated with the SMBus***. As note *supra*, Stanley and Tien, *et al.* are silent regarding a three parameter buffer access read or write. Therefore, the references fail to teach the novel methods employed by the AML event handler of the subject claim.

Furthermore, independent claim 25 recites *means embodied on a computer readable storage medium for the _Qxx control method to dispatch the SMB notification to the AML code event handler associated with the SMBus notification, where **the AML code event handler employs at least one of a three parameter buffer access read method to read data from an operation region associated with the SMBus or a three parameter buffer access write method to write data to an operation region associated with the SMBus***. Stanley and Tien, *et al.* fail to disclose a three parameter buffer access read or write and hence, fail to make obvious novel features of the subject claim.

In addition, dependent claims 5-8, 10-13, 22, and 23 recite specific descriptions of each of the parameters of the three parameter buffer read and write access. The Office Action cites the same sections of Tien, *et al.* as cited for the independent claims regarding this feature. As discussed above this reference fails to disclose a three parameter buffer read or write access. The

sections are also silent regarding the specific parameter descriptions recited in the subject dependent claims.

In view of at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that Stanley and Tien, *et al.*, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 14, 15 and 25 (and claims 2-8, 10-13, 16-24 and 26 which respectively depend there from) and thus fails to make obvious the subject claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP302US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731